



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,120	01/04/2002	Maher M. Hawash	42390P11782	1047

7590

10/19/2006

James H. Salter
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

FRENEL, VANEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/039,120	HAWASH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vanel Frenel	3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the Amendment filed on 7/17/06. Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 13, 15-16, 20, 25 and 29 have been amended. Claims 1-30 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greeven et al (2002/0143434) in view of Munoz et al (2002/0052760) and further in view of Allen (2003/0065626).

(A) Claims 1 and 16 have been amended to recite the limitation of : "a, transmitting", "from", "to a benefits management site", receiving the renewal request", "the", "management site", added by the benefits management site".

Greeven and Allen do not explicitly disclose that the method having : "a, transmitting", "from", "to a benefits management site", receiving the renewal request", "the", "management site", added by the benefits management site".

However, these features are known in the art, as evidenced by Allen. In particular, Allen suggests that the method having: "a, transmitting", "from", "to a benefits

management site", receiving the renewal request", "the", "management site", added by the benefits management site" (See Allen, Page 2, Paragraph 0018).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Allen within the collective teachings of Greeven and Munoz with the motivation of providing handheld devices in conducting health-related transactions that involve exchanges of electronic information across a network. Health professionals, such as physicians, medical staff, dentists, chiropractors, physical therapists, pharmacists, clinical trial specialists, biomedical researchers, health plan administrators, public officials, etc., may use handheld devices in performing their daily workflow (See Allen, Page 1, Paragraph 0002).

(B) Claim 5 –6, 13, 20, 29 have been amended to recite the limitation of "management site". However, this changes does not affect the scope and the breadth of these claims as they were originally presented, therefore these claims are rejected for the same reasons given in the previous Office Action, and incorporated herein.

(C) Claims 7 and 23 have been amended to recite the limitations of "management site" and "to the portable healthcare device". These limitations have been clearly shown in Page 2, Paragraph 0018 of Allen.

(D) Claim 9 has been amended to recite the limitations of: "a benefits management subsystem to receive a renewal request from a pharmacy site and to add prescription-

related information to the renewal request; and a healthcare subsystem coupled with the benefits management subsystem via a network pathway, the healthcare subsystem comprising;”, “the”, “management site”, “the”.

Greeven and Allen do not explicitly disclose that the method having “a benefits management subsystem to receive a renewal request from a pharmacy site and to add prescription-related information to the renewal request; and a healthcare subsystem coupled with the benefits management subsystem via a network pathway, the healthcare subsystem comprising;”, “the”, “management site”, “the”.

However, these features are known in the art, as evidenced by Allen. In particular, Allen suggests that the method having a benefits management subsystem to receive a renewal request from a pharmacy site and to add prescription-related information to the renewal request; and a healthcare subsystem coupled with the benefits management subsystem via a network pathway, the healthcare subsystem comprising;”, “the”, “management site”, “the” (See Allen, Page 7, Paragraphs 0069-0070).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Allen within the collective teachings of Greeven and Munoz with the motivation of providing handheld devices in conducting health-related transactions that involve exchanges of electronic information across a network. Health professionals, such as physicians, medical staff, dentists, chiropractors, physical therapists, pharmacists, clinical trial specialists, biomedical researchers, health

plan administrators, public officials, etc., may use handheld devices in performing their daily workflow (See Allen, Page 1, Paragraph 0002).

(E) Claim 15 has amended to recite the limitations of “wherein the healthcare subsystem” and “includes”. However, this changes does not affect the scope and the breadth of these claims as they were originally presented, therefore these claims are rejected for the same reasons given in the previous Office Action, and incorporated herein.

(F) Claim 25 has been amended to recite the limitations of “transmitting”, “from”, “to”, “management site”, “receiving the renewal request from the benefits management site”, “added by”, “management site”, management site”, “a”, “to the portable healthcare device”, “the”.

Greeven and Allen do not explicitly disclose that the method having “transmitting”, “from”, “to”, “management site”, “receiving the renewal request from the benefits management site”, “added by”, “management site”, management site”, “a”, “to the portable healthcare device”, “the”.

However, these features are known in the art, as evidenced by Allen. In particular, Allen suggests that the method having “transmitting”, “from”, “to”, “management site”, “receiving the renewal request from the benefits management site”, “added by”, “management site”, management site”, “a”, “to the portable healthcare device”, “the” (See Allen, Page 2, Paragraph 0018).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the features of Allen within the collective teachings of Greeven and Munoz with the motivation of providing handheld devices in conducting health-related transactions that involve exchanges of electronic information across a network. Health professionals, such as physicians, medical staff, dentists, chiropractors, physical therapists, pharmacists, clinical trial specialists, biomedical researchers, health plan administrators, public officials, etc., may use handheld devices in performing their daily workflow (See Allen, Page 1, Paragraph 0002).

(G) Claims 2-4, 8, 10-12, 14, 17-19, 21-22, 24, 26-28 and 30 have not been amended are therefore rejected for the same reasons given in the previous Office Action, and incorporated herein.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/17/06 with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not the applied art teaches customer-centered pharmaceutical product and information distribution system (2003/0074234).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vanel Frenel whose telephone number is 571-272-6769. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

V.F
V.F

October 2, 20006


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER